

PRG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,385	06/26/2001	Randy Prager	1584/65397	2918

23432      7590      12/31/2003  
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP  
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT      PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/892,385	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PRAGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kuen S Lu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2001.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:
    - 1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    - 2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    - 3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
  - a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 & 4.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "essentially" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrew et al. (U.S. Patent 5,542,086, hereafter "Andrew") in view of Isham (U.S. Patent 5,784,620), and further in view of Baker et al. (U.S. Patent 4,586,035, hereafter "Baker").

As per Claim 1, Andrew teaches "creating document object models comprising selected information from and about information assets of diverse types, created by

diverse software” at col. 3, lines 6-11, by recognizing types of document objects by signature and analyzing the signatures of document objects.

Andrew teaches neither consistency of the object models nor “displaying browse cards related to respective ones of the information assets in a time-ordered stream, together with glance views related to the document object models of the respective displayed documents, said glance views being displayed essentially in real time in response to passing a cursor over respective ones of the browse cards”.

However, Isham teaches consistency of object classes at col. 5, lines 18-21.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention was made to combine the reference of Isham into Andrew’s by implementing consistent object models because by doing so it would enable Andrew’s system to control system-wide data state and to provide cooperation between classes.

The combined Andrew-Isham reference teaches modeling documents into consistent object classes.

The combined Andrew-Isham reference does not teach displaying document object models.

However, Baker teaches “displaying browse cards related to respective ones of the information assets” (Fig. 1, element 20, lines 9-19, by displaying over-lapped windows designated by files) “in a time-ordered stream” (col. 4, lines 63-66, by activating display one at a time when cursor is crossing the particular window region), “together with glance views related to the document object models of the respective displayed documents,

said glance views being displayed essentially in real time in response to passing a cursor over respective ones of the browse cards" at Fig. 4, col. 5, lines 11-20, by displaying the window views of periphery regions as cursor crossing the regions.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine the references of Isham and Baker into Andrew's by utilizing the display of overlapping multiple windows for Andrew's plural representation of document objects because by doing so the need for switching from screen to screen for viewing the objects would be avoided.

**3. Conclusions**

**The prior art made of record**

- A. U.S. Patent No. 5542086
- B. U.S. Patent No. 5784620
- C. U.S. Patent No. 4586035

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- D. U.S. Patent No. 6006227
- E. U.S. Patent No. 6243724
- F. U.S. Patent No. 5586237

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.


Art Unit: 2177

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner 

December 18, 2003

  
GRETA ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER